

Atty. Dkt. No. 051373-0118 (24)

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 15 2006

REMARKS

This reply is in response to the Final Office Action mailed on June 14, 2006 in which Claims 1-20 were rejected. Claims 1-20, as amended, overcome the rejections and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-20 under 35 USC 102(e) Based upon Kadyk.

Page 2 of the Office Action rejected Claims 1-20 under 35 USC Section 102 (e) as being anticipated by Kadyk et al. US 2002/0157019. With this response, 1, 10 and 14 are amended. Claims 1-20, as amended, overcome the rejection based upon Kadyk.

Claim 1 recites a method of protecting a username. The method includes a step of communicating authentication information including plain text unencrypted information and an obscured username over a nonsecure communication channel from a client.

Claim 10 recites a username protection process which includes initiating a communication session between a user and a selected server by the communication of the obscure version of a plain text user identifier and plain text unencrypted information over a plain text communication channel.

Claim 14, as amended, recite a system for protecting username. The system includes a client device configured to communicate plain text unencrypted information over unsecure mutation channels with an obscured user identifier. Thus, each of Claims 1, 10 and 14 recite a method, process or system wherein an obscured user identifier or username along with plain text unencrypted information is communicated over an unsecure communication channel.

Kadyk fails to disclose or suggest a method, process or system wherein an obscured user identifier or username is communicated with plain text unencrypted information over an unsecure channel. In contrast, the system disclosed by Kadyk always communicates the

Atty. Dkt. No. 051373-0118 (24)

username or user identifier over a secure or encrypted channel such that none of the information communicated with the username or user identifier is plain text. In attempting to reject Claims 1 and 10, the Office Action asserts that Kadyk discloses the communication of an obscured username or user identifier over a non-secure communication channel or plain text communication channel by referring to Paragraphs 12, 13 and 61 of Kadyk.

However, Paragraphs 12, 13 and 61 of Kadyk do not disclose the communication of an obscured or encrypted username or user identifier over a nonsecure or plain text channel. Paragraphs 12 and 13 merely disclose, in the background section of Kadyk, the known method of tunneling. As described by Kadyk and as known to those of ordinary skill in the art, the process of tunneling does not involve communicating an obscured or encrypted username or user identifier over an unsecure or plain text communication channel. As clearly set forth in Paragraph 12, "in tunneling, the proxy receives an encrypted message from the client that is addressed to a server.... Operating on behalf of the client, the proxy forwards the encrypted message to the server." (Emphasis added). Thus, the entire message is encrypted. Nowhere do Paragraphs 12 and 13 disclose that an obscured username is communicated along with plain text information over an insecure unencrypted channel.

Paragraph 61 also fails to disclose the communication of an obscured username or user identifier over an insecure communication channel. Although paragraph 61 recites an insecure client-proxy connection. This insecure client-proxy connection is only established after authentication between the client and the proxy has been completed over a secure communication channel. A complete reading of Kadyk in context reveals that what Kadyk discloses, at most, is a process including the steps of (1) establishing a secure connection between a client and a proxy for the exchange of authentication data (i.e. a user identifier), (2) the proxy negotiating a secure end-to-end communication between the client and a server, (3) downgrading the client-proxy channel from a secure channel to an unsecure channel once the secure end-to-end channel has been negotiated with the server. (See paragraphs 61-63 of Kadyk). In other words, the user identifier or username is always communicated over a secure channel.

Atty. Dkt. No. 051373-0118 (24)

In response to Applicants' previous points raised in the response filed on March 27, 2006, the Office Action refers to Paragraph [0062] of Kadyk and attempts to rely upon the teaching of Kadyk that the information exchange between client 502 and cascaded proxy 506a to exchange through an insecure client-proxy connection. The Office Action asserts that this disclosure reads on the limitations of communicating authentication information or a non-secure communication channel from a client.

In response, Claims 1, 10 and 14 are amended to clarify that plain text unencrypted information is communicated along with the unsecured username over the non-secure communication channel from the client. Kadyk does not disclose transmitting plain text unencrypted information along with an obscured or encrypted username. In contrast, all information communicated from the client is encrypted to some degree. Although information communicated between the client and the proxy server is over an "insecure client-proxy connection," this insecure client-proxy connection encapsulates a secure end-to-end client/server connection. As a result, all information transmitted across the insecure client-proxy connection is already encrypted. As noted in Paragraph [0018] of Kadyk:

The additional layer of protection provided by the secure client-proxy connection is now redundant and the proxy downgrades the connection so that it is no longer encrypted. The client and server encrypt all data they exchanged through the tunnel, and one level of encryption is sufficient.

Accordingly, Claims 1, 10 and 14, as amended, overcome the rejection based upon Kadyk. Claims 2-9, 11-13 and 15-20 depend from Claims 1, 10 and 14, respectively, and overcome the rejection for the same reasons.

## II. Conclusion

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

Atty. Dkt. No. 051373-0118 (24)

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-3815. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 50-3815. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 50-3815.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

August 15, 2006

By

Todd A. Rathe

RATHE PATENT &amp; IP LAW

Customer No. 59555

Telephone: (262) 478-9353

Facsimile: (262) 238-1469

Todd A. Rathe

Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 38,276